REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 26, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-24 were pending, allowed claims 18-20, objected to claims 3-16, 22 and 23 and rejected claims 1-2, 21 and 24. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-24 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to claims 3-16, 22 and 23 and indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. It is believed that the Examiner intended to include claim 17 in this list of claims as claim 17 is dependent on claim 3. These claims have been so rewritten and it is submitted that these claims have not been narrowed and have the same scope as prior to being made independent and are now allowable. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the alleged admitted prior art and Chung..

Chung discusses a LAN device in which any of plural ports receive a packet and an appropriate port relays the packet onward. It is essentially a packet relay device. A triplet processor reads a destination address in a packet received by a transmitter and also passes or cuts through to a receiver packets on a bus interconnecting the port triplet processors. "Each triplet processor operates independently and simultaneously to execute cut-through packet switching or store-and-forward packet switching using the high-speed bus." See Chung, col. 4, lines 34-37.

In contrast, the invention of claim 1, in a non-limiting example, is essentially a broadcasting device and thus operates very differently because of this difference in purpose. The broadcasting device operates with central control from a processor that allows providing information about when and where to transmit the packet:

> a transmission unit generating a packet for each receiver based on information about a receiver provided by the processor through an input/output bus and transmission data, and transmitting the packet to a connected network, in response to an instruction issued by said processor of said information processing device

(See claim 1)

Chung does not teach or suggest such centralized control.

Further, the information about the destination in Chung comes from the received packet.

This is in contrast to the invention example noted above where such information comes from the processor. Chung does not teach or suggest such destination information coming from a processor.

The alleged admitted prior art adds nothing to Chung with respect to the above discussed features.

Independent claims 21 and 24 emphasizes similar features.

It is submitted that the invention of independent claims 1, 21 and 24 distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claim depends from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claim also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. Claim 2 emphasizes the processor providing receiver relevant information to each of plural transmission units. The prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/25/06

By: _____

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501